REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. No claim amendments are made by this Response. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks Examiner Dinh for the allowance of claims 8-11 and 18-20.[1] However, for the reasons set forth hereafter, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are directed to allowable subject matter and that the application is in condition for allowance.

II 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 12-17 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over French et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,685) in view of Nishimoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,164). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

French discloses a method and system that allows for multiple network names on a single server. With the method and system of French, a primary server name and one or more secondary server names are registered with a server via a configuration file. The server is able to respond to requests directed to either the primary server name or the one or more secondary server names. In this way, when a server fails, another server in the cluster may take over responding to requests to that server name.

Claim 1, which is representative of the other rejected independent claims 12 and 21 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

[1] Although the Office Action Summary Sheet indicates that these claims are objected to, the text of the Office Action makes it clear that these claims have been allowed (see page 3 of the Office Action).

1. A method for executing a function on a server in a distributed data processing system, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

receiving a request for a function, wherein the request comprises an input specifying a server name, wherein the server responds to requests directed to a set of server names;

generating a server name mask based on the server name; and

executing the function in a server name context on the server, as directed by the input specifying the server name, based on the generated server name mask. (emphasis added)

French does not teach the generation of a server name mask or the execution of a function in a server name context based on a generated server name mask. While French teaches that a configuration file for a server may have a primary server name and a plurality of secondary server names to which a server responds, there is no teaching in French to generate a server name mask based on a server name specified in a request for a function. In fact, there is no mention whatsoever in French regarding masks, let alone a server name mask. The Office Action is in agreement and admits that French "does not specifically disclose using a server name mask based on a server name" (Office Action, page 1, section 3).

However, the Office Action alleges that this feature is taught by Nishimoto in Figures 7, 20A and 20B, the abstract, column 12, line 20 to column 13, line 60, and column 23, line 1 to column 24, line 60. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Nishimoto is directed to an information management system and apparatus using an open network environment. The system of Nishimoto is directed to solving the problems of freshness of information being dependent on the frequency with which a user accesses a server and the user having to input personal information every time they access a different service (see column 1, lines 44-66, for example). In order to solve these problems, Nishimoto allows a user to register with a connection server information regarding the types of information that the user is interested in and the priority of the communication channels, e.g., emergency, regular confirmation, and preservation channels, that IP servers may use to send information to the user's client device.

That is, the user of a client device registers public personal information (see Figure 8) and connection permission information (see Figure 5) with a connection server. The

public personal information includes the information regarding an ID of the user, the kinds of information that are necessary, e.g., real estate exchange, stock exchange, conference schedule, etc. (see column 12, lines 44-67), and personal information including name, address, telephone number, etc. The connection permission information includes a designation for each channel type, those IP servers that are allowed to communicate with the client device over that type of channel and those IP servers that are not allowed to communicate with the client device over that type of channel. This may include a list of a plurality of names of IP servers.

The details of how the system works are set forth in column 18, line 35 to column 21, line 47. In this section of Nishimoto, the operation of the system is described as the user editing their public information 102 to input "real estate" into the kind of necessary information of the inevitable public items 148, the ID code of the user A is already allocated and is used to automatically form connection information having the ID code "xyz." The connection information is transmitted to the connect server 12 which registers the connection information. The client device 10 then sends the public personal information to the connection server 12 which updates and registers a record of the public personal information. When the public personal information is registered, the connection server 12 recognizes that "real estate" is a kind of necessary information and transmits a registration form for special personal information registration which has been specialized for "real estate" to the client device 10. The user may then edit this form to input the information which is of interest to the user (see the example in column 21, lines 14-17).

Periodically, the IP server 14 of a real estate company request connection server 12 to retrieve the ID code having an access permission that allows the real estate company to access the public personal information associated with the ID code. The connection server 12 transmits the registered ID codes for which access permission is allowed. As a result, the ID code "xyz" is transmitted to the IP server 14. The IP server 14 then requests the public personal information for the ID code. The connection server 12 then returns the public personal information to the IP server 14, which includes the designation of "real estate" as necessary information.

The IP server 14 then, having determined that the ID code "xyz" has a necessary information type of "real estate", requests the connection information for this ID code.

The connection server 14 refers to the connection permission information associated with the ID code "xyz" and recognizes that the permission IP server host name "All" is associated with the preservation channel. As a result, a masking operation is performed so as to remove the password for the emergency channel and regular confirmation channel and leave only the password of the permitted preservation channel (see column 20, lines 45-51). The IP address and preservation channel password in which the reception of information is permitted are then provided to the IP server 14. The IP server 14 may then request that the client 10 permit transmission using the preservation channel.

Nishimoto does not teach or suggest generating a server name mask based on a server name or executing a function in a server name context on a server based on the generated server name mask, as recited in independent claim 1. The "mask" referenced in Figure 16A step S108, 17E, 18B step S105, 19D, 24A step S108, 25A step S111, and 33 step S3, is the masking of passwords associated with the various channels, i.e. emergency, regular confirmation, and preservation channels (see column 20, lines 43-51; column 22, lines 10-34; column 23, lines 58-67; column 24, lines 20-23 and 46-48; and column 25, lines 54-60). That is, "masking" in the context of Nishimoto involves only sending connection information, i.e. the IP address of the client and the password, associated with a connection type with which the server may communicate with the client. Thus, for example, if the server is only allowed to communicate with the client via an emergency channel, then only the IP address and password associated with the emergency channel is sent to the server (see column 25, lines 54-60, for example).

The "masking" of Nishimoto is not associated with the generation of a server name mask based on a server name and is not used to execute a function in a server name context on a server. To the contrary, the "masking" in Nishimoto is used to send the IP address and password to the server for only the channels that the server can use to communicate with the client as defined by the connection permissions. The "mask" of Nishimoto has nothing to do with executing a function in a server name context and is not generated based on a server name. Thus, since the Office Action admits that French does not teach this feature, and Nishimoto has been shown to not teach or suggest this feature either, any alleged combination of Nishimoto and French cannot be found to teach this feature.

In addition, it is clear from the above explanation of the Nishimoto reference, that Nishimoto is directed to a completely different system than that of either the French reference or the present invention. The Nishimoto reference is directed to a system for allowing servers to initiate information downloads to client devices based on registered information types of interest to the users of the client devices and their designated channel permissions. French is directed to a method and system for allowing a single server to respond to multiple network names. These two systems are completely different and one of ordinary skill in the art would not have found it obvious to combine them in the manner alleged by the Office Action. Furthermore, it is not at all clear how one of ordinary skill in the art would combine these references assuming he/she were somehow motivated to do so.

Moreover, the alleged motivation provided by the Office Action is not based on the actual teachings of the references and is erroneous. The Office Action alleges that the motivation to combine Nishimoto with French is "because it would have provided a masking process to the personal information and provided a more secure network environment." The masking in Nishimoto is not performed on personal information. To the contrary, the masking in Nishimoto is directed to connection information, namely the IP address and password used by the server to transmit information to the client over a particular priority communication channel, i.e. emergency, regular confirmation, or preservation. Moreover, the masking is not performed to increase the security of the system but is rather used as a way for the user of the client device to control which IP servers may send information to the client and at which priorities the information is to be displayed on the client. Thus, the alleged motivation is not based in the actual teachings of the references and is rather an erroneous allegation used to bolster an attempted hindsight reconstruction of Applicant's claimed invention having first had benefit of Applicant's disclosure.

Thus, in view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that neither French nor Nishimoto, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of independent claims 1, 12 and 21. At least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 12 and 21, respectively, Applicant respectfully submits that neither French nor Nishimoto, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features of dependent claims 2-7, 13-

17 and 22. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 12-17 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In addition to the above, neither French nor Nishimoto, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the specific features recited in the dependent claims. For example, with regard to claims 5 and 16, French does not teach a server name tag that is generated based on a value of a server name and a value derived from a data structure that stores the server name. The Office Action alleges that this feature is taught in French at column 9, line 53 to column 10, line 54 and column 11 lines 3-67. Column 9, line 53 to column 10, line 54 discusses an exemplary failure of a server with another server assuming the responsibilities of the failed server, as depicted in Figures 9B-9D. As described, a server 904 is disconnected from the LAN 900 so that it can be reconfigured to assume the duties of the Inventory server. This reconfiguration may be manual through use of a command line interface by a system administrator. The system administrator may add the network name "Inventory" to the server names in a configuration file for the server 904 and server 904 may then be restarted. Upon restart, the server names in the configuration file are registered with the server name table of the network services administration module. Alternatively, these functions may be performed automatically.

Nowhere in columns 9 and 10 of French is it taught to generate a server name tag based on a value of a server name and a value derived from a data structure that stores the server name. All that is taught in French is the addition of a server name to a configuration file of a server that is to take over the responsibilities for a failed server and the registration of that server name in a server name table of a network services administration module.

Column 11, lines 3-67 of French teaches that the server 904, which is taking over the responsibilities for failed server 905, has access to the information previously stored by server 905 on a shared disk 906. In addition, the invention described in French may be used in a migration scenario in which a server that is initially configured to respond to multiple server names is reconfigured so that multiple servers may respond to those server names. Nowhere in column 11 is it taught to generate a server name tag based on

a value of a server name and a value derived from a data structure that stores the server name.

As another example, with regard to claims 6 and 17, French does not teach that the value derived from the data structure is a position value of the server name within a server name table that stores the set of server names. The Office Action alleges that this feature is taught at column 7, line 12 to column 8, line 63 and column 9, line 53 to column 10, line 54. The text of columns 9 and 10 has been addressed above with regard to claims 5 and 16. Nowhere in this text is it ever taught to generate a server name tag based on a value of a server name and a value from a data structure that is the position value of the server name within a server name table that stores the set of server names.

In addition, column 7, line 12 to column 8, line 63 of French teaches the software components within a server that provide for multiple network names on a server. These components include data structures 538 which contain server name table 542 that contains a set of server names, such as primary server name 543 and secondary server names 544-546. Only one primary name may be registered per server, but multiple secondary server names may be registered per server. At initialization, the server reads the configuration file and determines if parameters in the configuration file indicate a primary or secondary server name. If so, they are registered in the server name table of the network services administration module. There is nothing in columns 7 or 8 that teaches to generate a server name tag based on a value of a server name and a value derived from a data structure that stores the server name.

Thus, in addition to being distinguishable over French and Nishimoto by virtue of their dependency, claims 5-6 and 16-17 are also distinguishable based on the features specifically recited in these claims.

III. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over French and Nishimoto and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: June 5, 2003

Stephen J. Walder, Jr.
Reg. No. 41,534
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Attorney for Applicant